FINAL REPORT ON THE TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PERMITS FOR 2001

Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Revised June 2002

FINAL REPORT ON THE TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PERMITS FOR 2001 – REVISED June 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under the Virginia Waste Management Act and the Solid Waste Management Regulations, at least once every ten years, the Director must review and issue written findings on the environmental compliance history of each permittee, material changes, if any, in key personnel, and technical limitations, standards, or regulations on which the original permit was based. The reviews are to be undertaken in accordance with time periods established by regulation of the Virginia Waste Management Board for different categories of permits.

This final report presents the results of a review of all active solid waste management facility permits issued prior to July 1, 1991, as required by statute and regulation. Ninety-seven (97) permits issued prior to that date are still active and have been reviewed for this report. An initial report on these facilities was issued in 2001, and the Department sought public comment until October 5, 2001. This final report includes changes made in response to public comment.

The review included both an environmental compliance history review and a technical review. The environmental compliance history review consisted of a compilation of the past ten years of inspection records. The findings include the number of inspections conducted each year and the number of alleged violations. The requirements for disclosure statements, including changes to key personnel, were among the criteria examined in the environmental compliance history review. In response to comments, the Department reviewed the criteria used to count violations to assure that it was being consistently applied across the state. Department staff also met with several facilities upon request to review the facilities' compliance history.

The technical review compared the contents of the existing, individual permits to the contents now required for issuance of a permit. Over the years, the permitting standards have been changed by statute, and by amendments to the governing regulations in December 1988, March 1993, and May 2001. The findings of the technical review identify the components, or modules, that are required in current permits but that have not been included in the existing, individual permits. The technical review does not include documents that facilities may have developed or submitted for approval in accordance with regulatory requirements, but that have not been included in the permit itself. Therefore, a notation in the technical review that a component or module is not included in a permit does not necessarily imply that a facility lacks a plan approved by the Department addressing that element or that the facility is out of compliance. It may mean, however, that the documents that have been developed,

submitted, or approved are not entirely consistent with the current requirements for issuance of a permit.

By statute, if the Director finds repeated material or substantial violations of the permittee or material changes in the permittee's key personnel that would make continued operation of the facility not in the best interest of human health or the environment, the Director shall amend or revoke the permit. Also, the Director may amend the permit to include additional limitations, standards or conditions when the underlying standards have been changed by statute or regulation, or as otherwise provided by law.

The environmental compliance history review shows that as the number of inspections conducted each year has increased since 1991, the average number of alleged violations per inspection has decreased. There are variations in the average number of alleged violations per inspection.

The technical findings indicate that forty-seven (47) facilities have permits that were issued prior to December 21, 1988, and are without any of the components, or modules, required in current permits. Although these facilities lack current, facility-specific permit modules, they remain subject to their existing permits, any approved plans, and the standards in the applicable regulations.

Any permit amendment will take place in accordance with the Virginia Waste Management Act and the Virginia Administrative Process Act.

The Director retains authority to revoke, amend, or suspend permits in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The Director also retains authority to address violations of statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements by order or other remedy, including immediate action as necessary, in appropriate circumstances.

FINAL REPORT ON THE TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PERMITS FOR 2001 – REVISED June 2002

AUTHORITY AND BACKGROUND

This Final Report on the Ten-Year Review of Solid Waste Management Permits For 2001 is issued pursuant to Virginia statutory and regulatory requirements.

The Virginia Waste Management Act, at Va. Code ' 10.1-1408.1 E, requires the Director of the Department of Environmental Quality (Director and Department, respectively) to review and issue written findings on specific aspects of permitted solid waste management facilities at least once every ten years. The reviews are to be undertaken in accordance with time periods established by regulation of the Virginia Waste Management Board for different categories of permits. The pertinent part of Va. Code ' 10.1-1408.1 E states as follows:

At least once every ten years, the Director shall review and issue written findings on the environmental compliance history of each permittee, material changes, if any, in key personnel¹, and technical limitations, standards, or regulations on which the original permit was based. The time period for review of each category of permits shall be established by Board regulation.

The same section of the Code addresses amendment or revocation of solid waste management permits based on the required review and findings:

If, upon such review, the Director finds that repeated material or substantial violations of the permittee or material changes in the permittee's key personnel would make continued operation of the facility not in the best interests of human health or the environment, the Director shall amend or revoke the permit, in accordance herewith. Whenever such review is undertaken, the Director may amend the permit to include additional limitations, standards, or conditions when the technical limitations, standards, or regulations on which the original permit was based have been changed by statute or amended by regulation or when any of the conditions in subsection B of § 10.1-1409 exist. The Director may deny, revoke, or suspend any permit for any of the grounds listed under subsection A of § 10.1-1409.

Final Report on the Ten-Year Review of Solid Waste Management Permits For 2001 Revised June 2002

¹ "Key personnel" means the permit applicant and any person employed by the applicant in a managerial capacity, or empowered to make discretionary decisions, with respect to the solid waste operations. *See* Va. Code §10.1-1400.

The Virginia Waste Management Board established by regulation that the first review of permits would address facilities in existence prior to July 1, 1991. Ninety-seven (97) active solid waste management facilities with permits issued before July 1, 1991, have been reviewed for this report. An initial report on these facilities was issued in July 2001, and the Department sought public comment until October 5, 2001. This final report includes changes made in response to public comment.

In accordance with the statute, the review included both an environmental compliance history review and a technical review of the permit.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE HISTORY REVIEW

The environmental compliance history review consisted of a compilation of information from the Department's inspection records. The information included the number of inspections conducted each year and the number of alleged violations. The requirements for disclosure statements, including changes to key personnel, were among the criteria examined in this review.

Staff from the Department's regional offices conducted environmental compliance history reviews for the facilities located in their region. Staff examined all available inspection records dating back to July 1, 1991. This date was chosen because the law requiring the reviews was not in effect prior to 1991 and because compliance history from more than ten years ago would be of marginal relevance in evaluating a facility and its operators in 2001.

From this review, a simple tabulation was made of the number of inspections conducted and the number of alleged violations recorded. For consistency, worksheets were developed for conducting the reviews. The same worksheet was used for all landfills, because the regulatory criteria for landfills are similar, whether the landfill is for disposal of sanitary, industrial, or construction/demolition/debris waste. Non-landfill facilities were considered separately because of differences in regulatory criteria and because these facilities do not permanently retain waste on-site.

TECHNICAL REVIEW

The technical review compared the contents of the existing, individual permits for the facilities to the contents now required for issuance of a permit. Over the years, the permitting standards have been changed by statute, and by amendments to the governing regulations in December 1988, March 1993, and May 2001.

Staff from the Department's central office conducted the technical reviews. In particular, each of the 97 permits was reviewed to ascertain whether it contains the

² Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations (VSWMR), 9 Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) 20-80-100.C.

documentation required in a current solid waste management facility permit, as specified in Part VII of the Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations (VSWMR),³ including requirements of the Virginia Waste Management Act. The standards of VSWMR address the design, construction, operation, monitoring, closure, and post-closure maintenance for landfills and other solid waste management facilities, as necessary. Applicable permit elements, or modules, or portions of such modules, that are not included in existing, individual permits issued prior to July 1, 1991, were identified during the review.

As before, for consistency, a worksheet was developed for conducting the reviews. A separate worksheet was completed for each facility to document the content of the permit compared to current requirements.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT

The Department issued a report in July 2001, and solicited comment from facilities and the public until October 5, 2001. Detailed responses to comments are found in Attachment 1 to this Final Report. The following is a summary of the response to some of the comments of general applicability.

Consistency of Compliance History Review

Several commenters noted that the number of yearly inspections per facility were not uniform across the Commonwealth. As noted, Department staff examined all available inspection records dating back to July 1, 1991. In the past, before establishing regional offices, staffing levels may not have been adequate in every part of the state to perform the same number of inspections at every facility. Since then, the General Assembly has allocated additional staff and resources. Minimum inspection rates for each type of facility are now established in approved, annual inspection plans.

Several commenters also noted that the number of alleged violations per facility were not uniform across the Commonwealth, with some regions having higher rates of alleged violations per inspection than others. In preparation of the initial report, Department staff met and discussed the consistent application of the Compliance History Review Checklist. In response to comment, Department staff reviewed their application of the checklist, and some changes were made to the counting procedure to assure a uniform application across the state. The current tabulation is an accurate reflection of the data in the Department's records with similar violations being consistently marked. However, some regions still have a higher rate of alleged violations per inspection. The difference in the rate may reflect a difference in facility operation, but may also be influenced by the Department changing the frequency of inspections and increasing the staffing of the solid waste compliance program over the past ten years. Nevertheless, the Department will be providing additional training for its staff and undertaking additional review of the program to assure that all facilities across the Commonwealth are treated consistently.

_

³ 9 VAC 20-80-10, et seq.

Counting of "Alleged Violations"

Several commenters objected to the use of the term "alleged violations" and the counting of issues noted in inspection checklists, whatever their resolution. However, examining the resolution of each alleged violation would not have been possible. The method used was selected to assure the highest degree of consistency.

Facility Documents That Are Not Part of the Permit

Many commenters noted that their facilities have submitted plans, incorporated documents into the operating record, or follow regulatory requirements, even though the documents are not formally incorporated into the permit. Not including the documents in the Permit Review Checklist, they say, gives a misleading impression that the facility does not have such plans or documents, or that it is not in compliance with the regulations. Examples include gas management plans, operating plans, groundwater monitoring programs, closure plans, and financial assurance.

The statute requires the Department to review the "technical limitations, standards, or regulations on which the original permit was based." All of the permits subject to this review were issued prior to current regulations. The findings of the technical review are only to identify the components, or modules, that are required in current permits but that have not been included in the existing, individual permits. The technical review does not include documents that facilities may have developed or submitted for approval in accordance with regulatory requirements, but that have not been included in the permit itself. Therefore, a notation in the technical review that a component or module is not included in a permit does not necessarily imply that a facility lacks a plan approved by the Department addressing that element or that the facility is out of compliance. It may mean, however, that the documents that have been developed, submitted, or approved are not entirely consistent with the current requirements for issuance of a permit.

Additionally, information included in the Permit Review Checklist reflected contents of the permit on the date the permit was reviewed. Some facilities noted that their permits had been amended since the review of their permit was conducted. The Department acknowledges that some permits have been amended since a permit review checklist was completed for the facility's permit. The Department will consider any additional amendments or modifications the Department has approved since reviewing the permit when considering criteria for amending permits. A list of amendments issued after the permits were initially reviewed has been included as Table 6 in this report.

FINDINGS

The findings of the Ten-Year Permit Review are the product of the environmental compliance history review and the technical review. The written findings for individual facilities are contained in Appendices 1 through 4, as described below. Summary

information is provided in Tables 1 through 5. The Appendices and Tables have been revised in response to comments.

The findings of the environmental compliance history reviews for landfills are provided in Appendix 1, which contains a Compliance Review Worksheet for each landfill subject to this report. The findings of the environmental compliance history reviews for non-landfills are provided in Appendix 2, which contains a Compliance Review Worksheet for each non-landfill facility subject to this report. The compliance criteria are listed in the first column of each worksheet. The number of inspections conducted at the facility by year is provided in the first two rows of each worksheet. The number of times an alleged violation was cited in the inspection reports for a particular year is displayed in the cell corresponding to the criteria and year. Each worksheet also presents the average number of alleged violations per inspection.

A summary of the environmental compliance history review for all landfills is included as Table 1. It lists the number of inspections, the number of alleged violations, and the average number of alleged violations per inspection for all landfills subject to this report. The same information for non-landfill facilities is listed in Table 2. These tables show that as the number of inspections conducted each year has increased since 1991, the average number of alleged violations per inspection has decreased. Table 3 shows the total alleged violations and the total alleged violations per inspection for individual landfills. Table 4 shows the same information for non-landfills. There are variations in the average number of alleged violations per inspection.

The findings of the technical reviews for landfills are provided in Appendix 3, which contains a Permit Review Checklist for each landfill subject to this report. The first part of the worksheet contains information on the landfill, the reviewer, and a history of permitting activities (amendments and variances) for the facility. It also contains a summary of the comparison of the existing permit to the current regulatory requirements. The remainder of the worksheet for each facility details the current requirement, whether that requirement is found in the existing permit, the source of the requirement, and comments. The findings of the technical reviews for non-landfills are provided in Appendix 4, which contains Permit Review Checklists for non-landfills.

Permits that were issued prior to the December 21, 1988 VSWMR and have not been amended do not contain any of the components, or modules, currently required for permit issuance. ⁴ At a minimum, the pre-1988 permits require the following components to be consistent with current VSWMR: an Operations Plan (including attachments such as a Gas Management Plan and an Emergency Contingency Plan); a Groundwater Monitoring Plan; and a Closure and Post-Closure Plan.

The technical findings indicate that forty-seven (47) facilities were issued permits prior to December 21, 1988, that have not been amended. A list of these facilities is

-

⁴ The difference in the permitting standards between the March 1993 VSWMR and the May 2001 VSWMR are not significant for purposes of this report.

included as Table 5. Although these facilities lack current, facility-specific permit modules, they remain subject to their existing permits, any approved plans, and the standards in the applicable regulations. Again, a notation in the technical review that a component or module is not included in a permit does not necessarily imply that a facility lacks a plan approved by the Department addressing that element or that the facility is out of compliance. It may mean, however, that the documents that have been developed, submitted, or approved are not entirely consistent with the current requirements for issuance of a permit.

Permits that were issued between 1988 and 1991 (that have not been amended) generally incorporate the required standards by reference; however, those elements would not be identical with those for a current permit.

AMENDMENT OR REVOCATION OF PERMITS

As noted, under the governing statute, if the Director finds repeated material or substantial violations of the permittee or material changes in the permittee's key personnel that would make continued operation of the facility not in the best interest of human health or the environment, the Director shall amend or revoke the permit. Also, the Director may amend the permit to include additional limitations, standards or conditions when the underlying standards have been changed by statute or regulation, or as otherwise provided by law. Any permit amendment is subject to the requirements of the Virginia Waste Management Act, Va. Code § 10.1-1400, et seq., and Administrative Process Act, Va. Code § 2.2-4000, et seq.

The Director retains authority to revoke, amend, or suspend permits in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The Director also retains authority to address violations of statutory, regulatory or permit requirements by order or other remedy, including immediate action as necessary, in appropriate circumstances.

<u>Table 1 - Total Alleged Violations</u> Landfills (Sanitary Landfills, CDD Landfills, & Industrial Landfills)

YEAR	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of Inspections	83	108	161	263	248	278	327	298	449	600	2815
Alleged Violations	119	302	345	381	368	395	321	197	302	377	3107
Average Alleged Violations	1.43	2.80	2.14	1.45	1.48	1.42	0.98	0.66	0.67	0.63	1.10

AVERAGE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS PER INSPECTION:

1.10

<u>Table 2 - Total Alleged Violations</u>
Non-Landfills (Transfer Stations, Energy Recovery Facilities, and Gas Extraction Systems)

YEAR	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of Inspections	13	7	35	48	62	62	66	80	102	53	528
Alleged Violations	6	0	19	14	7	13	7	8	9	9	92
Average Alleged Violations	0.46	0.00	0.54	0.29	0.11	0.21	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.17	0.17

AVERAGE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS PER INSPECTION:

0.17

<u>Table 3 - Individual Facilities Alleged Violations</u> Landfills (Sanitary Landfills, CDD Landfills, & Industrial Landfills)

Average Alleged DEO Total Alleged Violations Site Name Region Violations Per Inspection Loudoun Co. LF NRO 18 0.55 001 014 Mecklenburg Co. LF PRO 45 1.22 021 Augusta Co. Service Authority LF VRO 25 1.19 Scott County Sanitary Landfill 023 SWRO 57 0.86 Prince William County Sanitary LF NRO 1.97 029 71 031 South Boston Sanitary LF PRO 52 1.37 041 City of Portsmouth / Craney Island LF TRO 32 0.73 City of Martinsville LF WCRO 049 71 1.69 062 Rockingham Co. LF VRO 61 2.65 065 First Piedmont Corp. LF WCRO 11 0.35 Franklin Co. LF WCRO 2.62 072 110 074 Stafford Co. LF / R-Board LF NRO 40 1.38 Rockbridge Co. LF / Buena Vista VRO 2.47 075 74 086 Appomattox Co. LF WCRO 73 1.74 Orange Co. LF NRO 090 101 3.06 091 Accomack Co. LF / Bobtown South TRO 102 2.43 092 Halifax Co. LF PRO 86 2.00 I-95 LF 103 NRO 4 0.14 125 Ivy Sanitary LF VRO 45 1.61 149 Fauquier Co. LF NRO 19 0.59 Caroline Co. LF 182 NRO 39 1.30 Waynesboro Nurseries, Inc. VRO 1.00 187 10 Louisa Co. LF 194 VRO 45 2.14 204 City of Waynesboro LF VRO 63 2.25 207 Hoechst-Celanese Fibers LF WCRO 0.52 24 222 Appalachian Power LF / Glyn Lyn WCRO 0.09 4 223 Appalachian Power LF / Clinch River SWRO 5 0.13 227 Lunenburg Co. LF PRO 60 1.54 Petersburg City LF 0.85 228 PRO 34 235 Cox's Charles City Road LF PRO 9 0.36 270 Taylor Road LF PRO 8 0.35 280 Holland Industrial LF TRO 1.24 41 Cambell Co. LF 285 WCRO 50 1.28 304 Nottoway Co. LF PRO 89 1.98 305 Thrasher CDD Landfill (Elbow Farms) TRO 62 1.27 307 U.S. Gypsum Company LF- Washington County SWRO 25 0.68 314 Hanover Co. LF PRO 49 1.17 322 Waltrip LF TRO 41 1.00 Hilltop Debris LF NRO 0.21 326 4

		DEQ	Total Alleged	Average Allege Violations
	Site Name	Region	Violations	Per Inspection
327	Rainwater Concrete Debris LF	NRO	25	1.19
31	Lorton CDD Landfill	NRO	15	0.75
46	Georgia Pacific Corp. North - Jarratt	PRO	18	0.86
353	Radford Army Ammunition Plant Ash LF #2	WCRO	6	0.16
363	Amoco LF / Yorktown Refinery	TRO	23	0.53
377	Shoosmith Debris LF	PRO	4	1.33
394	Westvaco Fly Ash LF #3	WCRO	15	0.41
397	Montgomery Regional Solid Waste Authority - Mid-County Landfill	WCRO	93	1.94
398	City of Virginia Beach LF #2	TRO	31	0.69
105	Greensville Co. LF	PRO	26	0.63
413	Westvaco Fly Ash LF #1	WCRO	10	0.27
414	Westwaco Fly Ash LF #2	WCRO	7	0.19
417	SPSA Regional LF	TRO	49	0.75
429	Fluvanna Co. LF	VRO	84	2.90
433	Radford Army Ammunition Plant Debris Landfill No. 2	WCRO	3	0.09
436	Wolftrap Debris LF	TRO	39	0.83
440	VA Power Ash LF- Chesapeake	TRO	26	0.74
441	Potomac LF	NRO	53	2.04
445	Thomas Brothers Debris LF	WCRO	58	1.93
451	Indian Trail Disposal Facility	TRO	35	0.92
456	Lynchburg Foundry LF / Lynchburg	WCRO	18	0.62
457	Virginia Power Industrial LF- Yorktown	TRO	17	0.44
461	Accomack Co. LF / Northern Site	TRO	86	1.83
469	Shenandoah Co. LF	VRO	58	2.32
471	Weaver Industrial Waste LF	PRO	22	0.88
493	Higgerson / Buchanan LF	TRO	41	0.89
498	Bristol Debris LF	SWRO	56	0.82
504	International Paper LF	TRO	9	0.24
506	623 CDD LF	PRO	5	0.20
507	Northampton Co. LF	TRO	91	1.98
508	Carroll - Grayson - Galax Regional LF	SWRO	51	1.09
513	Wise Co. LF	SWRO	117	1.72
514	Roanoke Cement Company LF	WCRO	10	0.30
516	Qualla Road LF	PRO	13	0.59
517	Lynchburg Foundry LF / Falwell	WCRO	16	0.57
520	Rappahannock Co. LF	NRO	28	0.97
522	Westaco Asbestos LF	WCRO	2	0.05
524	Simons Hauling Company Debris Landfill	PRO	30	1.67
525	Cox's Darbytown Road LF	PRO	7	0.26
527	Abex Corporation Industrial Landfill	VRO	1	0.08
529	Frederick County Sanitary Landfill	VRO	38	1.58
531	Charles City County Sanitary Landfill	PRO	12	0.27

<u>Table 4 - Individual Facilities Alleged Violations</u> Non-Landfills (Transfer Stations, Energy Recovery Facilities, and Gas Extraction Systems)

Average Alleged DEQ Total Alleged Violations Site Name Region Violations Per Inspection 185 VPI Pathological Incinerator WCRO 16 297 Hampton/NASA Refuse-Fired Steam Generating Facility TRO 0.03 387 I-66 Transfer Station NRO 0 0.00 Harrisonburg Resource Recovery Facility VRO 18 390 2.57 396 SPSA VA Beach Transfer Station #1 TRO 7 SPSA Ballentine Transfer Station 421 TRO 6 0.13 425 SPSA Chesapeake Transfer Station TRO 2 0.04 435 Alexandria / Arlington RRF NRO 0.35 SPSA Franklin Transfer Station 438 TRO 4 0.11 SPSA Refuse Derived Fuel Plant 455 TRO 1 0.02 482 SPSA NNS Recovery Facility TRO 7 0.12 484 SPSA Boykins Transfer Station TRO 0.03 SPSA Isle of Wight Transfer Station 0 494 TRO 0.00 510 NRO 2 I-95 Energy RRF 0.09 534 BFI Telegraph Road Gas Ext. System NRO 0 0.00 871-I American Waste Industries TRO 20 0.80

<u>Table 5 – Facilities Permitted before December 21, 1988</u> No subsequent amendments after December 21, 1988

Permit Number	Facility Name			
014	Mecklenburg Co. LF			
021	Augusta Co. Service Authority LF			
023	Scott Co. Sanitary Landfill			
041	City of Portsmouth / Craney Island LF			
049	City of Martinsville LF			
072	Franklin Co. LF			
074	Stafford Co. LF / R-Board LF			
075	Rockbridge Co. LF / Buena Vista			
185	VPI Pathological Incinerator			
187	Waynesboro Nurseries LF			
194	Louisa Co. LF			
207	Hoechst-Celanese Fibers LF			
227	Lunenburg County Landfill			
235	Cox's Charles City Road LF			
280	Holland Industrial LF			
305	Thrasher CDD Landfill (Elbow Farms)			
307	US Gypsum Company LF- Washington Co.			
322	Waltrip LF			
326	Hilltop Debris LF			
327	Rainwater Concrete Debris LF			
331	Lorton CDD LF			
346	Georgia Pacific Corp. North - Jarratt			
353	Radford Army Ammunition Plant Ash LF #2			
363	Amoco LF / Yorktown Refinery			
390	Harrisonburg Resource Recovery Facility			
394	Westvaco Fly Ash LF #3			
396	SPSA-VA Beach Transfer Station #1			
413	Westvaco Fly Ash LF #1			
414	Westvaco Fly Ash LF #2			
421	SPSA-Ballentine Transfer Station			
425	SPSA-Chesapeake Transfer Station			
429	Fluvanna Co. LF			
433	Radford Army Ammunition Plant Debris LF No. 2			
436	Wolftrap Debris LF			
438	SPSA-Franklin Transfer Station			
445	Thomas Brothers Debris LF			
457	Virginia Power Industrial Landfill- Yorktown			
482	SPSA-NNS Recovery Facility			
484	SPSA-Boykins Transfer Station			
493	Higgerson / Buchanan LF			
494	SPSA-Isle of Wight Transfer Station			
507	Northampton Co. LF			
510	I-95 Energy RRF			
517	Lynchburg Foundry LF-Falwell			
522	Westvaco Asbestos LF			
534	BFI Telegraph Road Gas Ext. System			
871-I	American Waste Industries			
0 / 1-1	rameticali w asic flidustries			

<u>Table 6-</u>

<u>Amendments Issued Since Permits Included in the Ten Year Permit Review were Initially Reviewed</u>

Facility Name	Permit Number	Type	Date
Loudoun Co. Lf	001	Major	3/19/01
Prince William County Sanitary Lf	029	Minor	12/07/01
South Boston Sanitary LF	031	Major (GPS)	8/8/01
First Piedmont Corp. LF	065	Minor	4/26/02
First Piedmont Corp. LF	065	Major	1/30/01
Appomattox Co. LF	086	Major (GPS)	2/11/02
Halifax Co. Lf	092	Minor	10/22/01
Fauquier Co. LF	149	Major(GPS)	1/23/01
City of Waynesboro Lf	204	Minor	9/6/01
Appalachian Power Lf - Glen Lyn	222	Minor	7/31/01
Appalachian Power Lf - Glen Lyn	222	Minor	5/07/02
Taylor Road Lf	270	Major	7/27/01
Campbell Co. LF	285	Major	8/7/01
Montgomery Regional Solid Waste Author	ity	•	
- Mid-County Landfill	397	Major	2/27/01
City of Virginia Beach Lf #2	398	Minor	11/14/01
SPSA - Regional Lf	417	Minor	10/15/01
Potomac Lf	441	Minor	2/4/02
Virginia Power Industrial Lf - Yorktown	457	Major	10/22/01
Accomack Co. Lf. / Northern Site	461	Minor	12/21/01
Weaver Industrial Waste LF	471	Major (GPS)	4/30/02
Bristol Debris Lf	498	Minor	10/22/01
International Paper Lf	504	Major	3/08/01
623 CDD LF	506	Minor	12/13/01
Wise Co. LF	513	Minor	12/21/01
Cox's Darbytown Road LF	525	Minor	5/21/02
Frederick County Sanitary Landfill	529	Major	8/3/01
Charles City County Sanitary Landfill	531	Minor	4/8/02

Appendix 1 - Compliance Review Checklists for Landfills Sanitary Landfills, CDD Landfills and Industrial Landfills

NOTE: This appendix is available as a separate download from the Department's website.

Appendix 2 - Compliance Review Checklists for Non-Landfills

Transfer Stations, Energy Recovery Facilities, and Gas Extraction Systems

NOTE: This appendix is available as a separate download from the Department's website.

Appendix 3 - Permit Review Checklists for Landfills Sanitary Landfills, CDD Landfills and Industrial Landfills

NOTE: This appendix is available as a separate download from the Department's website.

Note: The technical review does not include documents that facilities may have developed or submitted for approval in accordance with regulatory requirements, but that have not been included in the permit itself. Therefore, a notation in the technical review that a component or module is not included in a permit does not necessarily imply that a facility lacks a plan approved by the Department addressing that element or that the facility is out of compliance. It may mean, however, that the documents that have been developed, submitted, or approved are not entirely consistent with the current requirements for issuance of a permit. Facilities that lack current, facility specific permit modules remain subject to their existing permits, any approved plans, and the standards in the applicable regulations.

Appendix 4 - Permit Review Checklists for Non-Landfills

Transfer Stations, Energy Recovery Facilities, and Gas Extraction Systems

NOTE: This appendix is available as a separate download from the Department's website.

Note: The technical review does not include documents that facilities may have developed or submitted for approval in accordance with regulatory requirements, but that have not been included in the permit itself. Therefore, a notation in the technical review that a component or module is not included in a permit does not necessarily imply that a facility lacks a plan approved by the Department addressing that element or that the facility is out of compliance. It may mean, however, that the documents that have been developed, submitted, or approved are not entirely consistent with the current requirements for issuance of a permit. Facilities that lack current, facility specific permit modules remain subject to their existing permits, any approved plans, and the standards in the applicable regulations.

Attachment 1

Responses to Comments Received

NOTE: This appendix is available as a separate download from the Department's website.